

Bond Reimbursement and Grant Review Committee Meeting Minutes
March 16, 2011
Department of Education and Early Development
Alaska Permanent Fund Conference Room
Juneau, Alaska

Committee Members	EED Staff	Other Attendees
Elizabeth (Sweeney) Nudelman - Chair	Sam Kito	Robert Reed - LYSD
Representative Peterson	Kim Andrews	David Dunsmore – Rep. Peterson’s Office
Mary Cary	Michelle Norman	Don Hiley – SERRC
Mark Langberg*		Kathy Brown – SERRC
Robert Tucker		Charlie Carlson - SERRC
Carl John		
Doug Crevensten		
Dean Henrick		

*attended via teleconference

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL 9:08am

AMENDMENT of and APPROVAL of MINUTES

Minutes approved as submitted

AMENDMENT of and APPROVAL of the AGENDA

Agenda approved as submitted

PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment. Carl John introduced his colleague, Mr. Robert Reed, the new director of maintenance and facilities for the LYSD.

STAFF BRIEFING – Refer to attachment for details

Sam provided a brief overview for the benefit of Representative Peterson explaining the purpose of the BR&GR and the specific purpose of the current meeting and including what information will be covered in the meeting today.

Debt Reimbursement Funding Status (SB237 Report)

Last year the legislature passed SB237 which modified the sunset requirement for the debt program and also made some modifications to the grant program.

Under SB237 starting July 1, 2011, the total amount of bond authorization requested is \$144,616,551. The total amount approved by the department is \$144,076,551. The total voter approved amount is \$72,751,551. The amount for projects that are both voter and EED approved is \$72,751,551.

Debt Reimbursement voter and EED approved at 70% - \$72,751,551

Debt Reimbursement voter and EED approved at 60% - \$0

Elizabeth noted that some of the projects listed on page 9 reflect 60% approval – Kim clarified that those projects have not yet been voter approved.

Final CIP Lists

On March 17th and 18th, the State Board of Education is meeting in Juneau and will consider the final CIP priority lists. The Final CIP lists are included in the packet, there were no changes between the reconsideration list and this final list.

For FY2012, 38 of 53 school districts submitted a total of 158 applications for the first year of the districts' revised six-year plans, 113 of the applications were scored, and the districts requested that 45 application scores be re-used for the FY 2012 list. The department determined that 9 applications were ineligible, modified the category of 6 projects that resulted in a change of list, and adjusted the budgets of 31 projects under the provisions of AS 14.11.

The major maintenance list contains a total of 117 projects amounting to a total of over \$275 million, and the school construction list contains a total of 32 projects amounting to a total of over \$313 million.

Carl John asked for clarification on the status of the governor's budget. Sam explained that the governor's budget funds up to project 14 on Major Maintenance list and project 1 on the Construction list. Carl asked whether or not there was word of additional funding consideration for Construction projects. Elizabeth stated the only information the department has is based on the governor's budget list. Additionally, there are the other 3 school construction projects which were funded by the November GO bonds. (Alakanuk, Kipnuk and Kwigillingok K-12 Schools)

Cost Model Update

This is not yet available, it is in draft and districts can expect to have it available for the training scheduled for May. The tentative date is May 6, 2011.

FY2013 Application Review and Approval

- **FY2013 Application begins on page 40**

Question 9. Have added a feature to sum the entered GSF providing an auto tabulated total SGF on the final line of the table.

Question 16. Added a line where the district can write in the name of their A/E consultant.

Carl asked if they district brings in a designer to do a survey – someone other than an A/E – suggested if this title could be changed to allow other professionals - perhaps change this to Design Consultant rather than A/E Consultant

Question 18. On table 2, row titled “Size/Dollar Adj. Factor” has been added. This correction has been added to accommodate for a smaller project which takes into account that a small project does not benefit from the economy of scale.

- **FY2013 Application Instructions start page 53**

Question 3. Added the word “current” to clarify that the plan submitted must be current.

Question 18. Updated to cost model update reference to the most current model.

Question 30. page 64 of 114

Assessment 1 – added language: “Discuss the quality of your program as it is reflected in the submitted objective reports (i.e. diversity in work types, hours available is accurate, there is a high percentage of reported hours).” This is asking that the district discuss in the narrative of their Preventative Maintenance program the qualitative aspects of the Preventative Maintenance reports that they have submitted.

Assessment 2 – clarified that the request for data is for the previous 12 months. Sam was asked if the department will be working with School Dude in creating the reports to meet this requirement. Sam explained School Dude responds to, and follows the request of the districts. If the district request the previous 12 months, they will do so. Sam clarified that the department will be flexible in the definition of 12 months, whether a district utilizes a calendar year, a fiscal year, or the 12 months preceding the application. Wayne Marquis has asked School Dude if they will put district and date information on the reports. They are reluctant to do so, but the request has been made.

- **FY2013 Rater’s Guide page 75-79**

Added category “D” to the Major Maintenance Column

- **FY2013 CIP Eligibility and Scoring Criteria page 80-81**

Added category “D” to the Major Maintenance Column

- **Subjective Rating Form page 82**

Added category “D” to the Major Maintenance Column

-BREAK-

Site Selection Criteria

We have polished the guideline and incorporated the DOT guidelines into the revision. We also incorporated the size metric used by the CEFPI guidelines. There is some narrative about how the guideline works and applying the guideline to different types of projects.

Page 89 of 114 used to have a size identified with various student populations. They recommend now looking at the program and other activities taking place on the site. This will allow districts to be a little more flexible in selecting a site. It allows the district to take into consideration the school GSF, if the school requires a soccer field, etc, and allows the acreage of the lot to score based more on the uses of the site.

Additional items have been reformatted but have no substantive modifications until you reach the DOT traffic Criteria

- **DOT Traffic Criteria** Page 93 of 114

Traffic Impact – A narrative has been added explaining this new criteria section. There had been a suggestion to test the criteria, but Sam noted that each district will individually weight criteria different and this would be difficult to test given the dramatic differences between districts. As a result, Sam did not put together a weighting recommendation for any of the criteria.

The Anchorage School District sent in a letter which Sam read aloud. It noted the district's requirement to abide by specific guidelines set by the city of Anchorage. Sam noted that the Site Selection Criteria are guidelines which should be viewed by the districts as a tool to help in site selection. They are not mandated and not in statute or regulation. Districts in the past have misunderstood and thought, for example, that the site minimum size was a mandate.

Bob asked if there could be language added to emphasize, particularly to larger districts, the impact not thinking through traffic consequences can have.

Mary suggested adding criteria which would take into consideration topography given the significant costs associated with building on a severe slope.

Sam took note and said he will work on these two suggestions and will circulate his changes via email to the committee.

Sam brought the committee's attention to pages 112 and 113 with the illustrations of consideration for both rural and urban site selection.

PUBLICATIONS UPDATE

Site Selection has been moved to the top of the publications review.

Swimming pool and PM & FM Guide drafts will be presented to the committee at the July meeting. (December meeting as the July meeting has been canceled).

Carl requested that the PM & FM Guide be prioritized as it will be of benefit to a larger number of districts than the swimming pool guidelines. Sam noted it is prioritized above the Swimming Pool guidelines.

Sam advised the department is looking at creating forms for procurement to be made available to districts to ensure compliance with state procurement requirements. While many districts have their own processes, smaller districts in particular could use forms as a starting point for successful procurement. These may be incorporated into the A/E guidelines or they may be made available on the department website.

Bob made a recommendation of having districts that are implementing or starting up a new PM program, to incorporate getting the employee's buy-in and coordination with the maintenance staff in order to ensure a successful implementation.

Carl suggested adding a recommendation of what adequate staffing is for custodial and maintenance for schools and even district teacher housing.

Sam responded that there generally are GSF guidelines for both custodial and maintenance standards. The department is not involved in any district housing, but did note that on the dept experience with Mt Edgumbe – the majority of unscheduled maintenance comes from the dorm side rather than the school facility side.

Elizabeth noted the department wants to make it clear that any guidelines such as this would not be a requirement – the dept does not want to be seen as dictating budget and where resources need to be directed.

Sam said he will do some research to see if the department can identify some generally accepted guidelines which can be incorporated into the PM & FM guide.

STAFF GOALS and OBJECTIVES

Database review

Sam explained that the department currently has a database system which while cumbersome is functional though we are working toward consolidation into a non-Access platform database.

Online CIP Application Status

Carl prepared a statement regarding the potential online application. He feels it is important that an online application allow for submission of photographs and graphs.

Sam responded that any online application submittal process would incorporate and allow for submittal of all supporting documentation. The first issue is that the underlying database would need to have the ability to link to the online application and submittals.

Staffing Update

We have advertised and are in the process of hiring for Kim's old School Finance Specialist II position. The department hopes to be fully staffed soon.

PROPOSED FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Mary asked that if there are any developments on Career Education or Vocational Education that related to facilities, the committee would like to be updated.

Carl asked if the CIP training will be in Anchorage this year.

Sam stated that there will be a single training session and it will be held in Anchorage.

ACTION ITEMS

Approve FY2013 CIP Application Supporting Documentation

FY2013 CIP Application Supporting Documentation Approved as submitted

Approve FY2013 CIP Application

Sam proposed changing the reference on question 16 from "A/E Consultant" be changed to "Design Consultant". This change was approved.

FY 2013 CIP Application approved as amended.

Approve Updated Site Selection Criteria – deferred until the next meeting

Sam noted there are two changes that were requested by the committee. These are more than technical edits. He recommended that the draft criteria could be made available to districts as needed, and the changes could be made and communicated via email with the committee.

Elizabeth clarified that we can make the criteria available as a draft. She is comfortable holding off on approval until the next meeting,

Mary noted there are Anchorage schools with seismic risk – given the current events in Japan – a footnote may be applicable to the criteria to ensure seismic awareness.

Sam noted that building codes do currently take into account seismic risk. The narrative does also provide for districts to add criteria.

Kim pointed out natural hazards on page 97 of 114, which notes “acts of God”.

Elizabeth proposed that the committee agree to bring this back publication back for review and approval at the next meeting. There were no objections.

SET DATE and LOCATION OF FUTURE MEETINGS

Sam noted he has no specific agenda items for a July meeting. In the past, the July meeting has been an opportunity to showcase recent activity in school construction.

Elizabeth presented the committee with options regarding the July meeting. The committee could meet in order to showcase some projects as Sam noted, could meet telephonically or the committee could not meet in July but rather meet again in December. These options were discussed and it was decided that the next scheduled meeting be set for December. The committee reserves the possibility of meeting telephonically should any critical business arise that cannot wait until December.

Next meeting December 2011, to be held again in Anchorage.

Elizabeth commended Sam on the work he has done on the publications review and asked that he provide any comments he has.

Sam noted he is working on adding energy efficiency guidelines to regulations. This is due to the legislative activity last year, during which energy efficiency requirements were put into statute. Sam will be putting out a white paper for districts and this committee to review in December.

The Department has a statute requiring the review of energy consumption and costs in the design phase of a project. As a result, projects beginning FY2012 will have an additional submittal requirement which provides the department with anticipated operating costs will be. It will be applied to new facilities, major renovations, etc. – it will be applied in situations when it makes common sense.

COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS

Mark noted he is pleased to see how efficiently these meetings have been happening.

Sam responded by proposing scheduling future meetings in a half-day format, and then organizing a planned excursion to visit new and existing school facilities.

Mary asked Mark if with the cost saving and energy modeling, is this something that would need to be added to the A/E agreement?

Mark explained that this would be an A/E addition. It could be a simple task, but on larger projects, cost modeling can be a complex and significant addition to the requested work. He cautioned about requiring lead certification – lead certification does not necessarily mean that a facility will be more energy efficient.

Sam explained that the department is looking to encourage specific energy efficiency, while some districts are within areas which already require lead certification for their public buildings so in those cases, it would not necessarily be any additional cost.

Bob is pleased to see the work on publications and the site selection guidelines. He sees the PM & FM Guidelines as a priority and applicable to more districts than the Swimming Pool Guidelines.

Mary noted that in the Anchorage School district there has been a movement toward more special education dedicated classrooms. Perhaps we may want to look at space guidelines taking into consideration special education given.

Carl expressed his appreciation for the hard work of the staff and congratulated Kim on her promotion.

Dean also thanked the department staff. He announced he will be retiring from KSD, but he does not expect that to affect his seat on the BRGR committee at this time.

Doug thanked the department for their hard work.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 11:15